

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 6, 7, 10-11, 12, 15-18, 22-25 and 27-30 remain in this application. Claims 1-5, 8-9, 13-14, 19-21 and 26 have been cancelled. Claim 11 has been rewritten in independent form. Claims 12, 25, 27 and 28 have been amended. The Examiner has acknowledged that claims 6, 7, 10 and 11 are directed to allowable subject matter. These claims will not be discussed further in this amendment. Claim 30 is new and is directed specifically to forward facing web cameras. Applicant requests consideration of new claim 30.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 25, 26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,636,256 to Passman et al. (hereinafter Passman) in view of U.S. Patent Application 2001/0032335 to Jones (hereinafter Jones). Claims 1, 2, 5 and 9 have been cancelled. Claim 25 has been amended to include the features of claim 26 that depended therefrom. Claim 26 has been cancelled. For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejections of claims 25 and 28 are traversed.

The present invention is directed to a communications system and method incorporating a plurality of vehicle mounted web cams that collect video information and transmit the video information together with other local information via a wireless network to a server. The video streams from the web cams and associated

information are available to users on an internet web page. Each camera has a specific identifier to permit users to access the video of specific individual cameras. Optimization software permits users to take virtual trips along predetermined routes. The system permits sequential access to multiple video feeds from desired locations. The system also permits a plurality of communication system users to access and display video information from the server.

Passman discloses a video communication system that transmits real-time information from a video monitoring system in a mobile vehicle to an internet website. The website can be accessed by persons through their computer that is connected to the Internet. Antennas are used for a global positioning system signal transmission and reception and for conventional RF communications.

Jones discloses a picture communications system for use in real-time communications. The system enables an originating user (i) to initiate a contact with another user, (ii) to receive an essentially immediate response as to the remote user's device status and willingness to receive an image from said originating user, (iii) to capture and send the image essentially immediately, and (iv) to engage in a useful real-time exchange with the remote user regarding the image; all in a manner consistent with the spontaneous and immediate nature of a telephone call.

In regard to amended claim 25, even if the references were combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the present invention would not result. The combination does not teach or suggest a server that classifies video information into public information accessible to all of a plurality of display sources and private information accessible to only a selected number of the plurality of display sources. Rather, the combination, specifically the teachings of Jones, teaches restriction on a

user by user basis instead of on a content-specific basis. For example, from paragraph [75] of Jones, if user A has access rights to device B, then user A can connect to device B. If device B is a viewer then user A has the right to connect to device B for the purpose of sending a picture file to device B. There is no content based limitation taught.

Claim 28 depends directly from amended claim 25 and is believed to be allowable for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 25 and 28 is respectfully requested.

Claims 12, 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Passman in view of Jones and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,917,405 to Joao (hereinafter Joao). Claim 12 has been amended and claim 14 has been cancelled. For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

Joao is directed to an apparatus for remote control, monitoring and/or security of vehicles. The vehicle equipment system may include video recording or photographing equipment. The video recording devices may be located at any location on the interior of the vehicle or the exterior. Real-time or deferred video transmission to a user is utilized.

Claim 12 has been amended to include the steps of collecting and transmitting information including vehicle speed, location and camera orientation to a server. Even if the references were combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the present invention would not result. Simply put, the combination does not teach transmission of all three types of information claimed.

Claim 16 depends directly from amended claim 12 and is believed to be

allowable for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12 and 16 is respectfully requested.

Claims 15, 17, 18, 22, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Passman in view of Jones, Joao and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,675,386 to Hendricks (hereinafter Hendricks). For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

Hendricks '386 is directed to a method and apparatus for communicating multiple live video feeds over the internet. Users are able to remotely control a video picture of a distant location. Text, graphics, and other video information may supplement one or more video pictures to provide an educational and entertaining system.

With regard to claims 15, 17, 18, 22, 23 and 24, there is no motivation in the art to combine the teachings of Passman and Hendricks in the manner proposed by the Examiner. In the example illustrated by Passman, a camera is used within a vehicle such as a school bus to monitor for fights between passengers. A security company or individual computer user monitors the video feed and alerts authorities if there is a problem. The Examiner posits that multiple cameras could be used, for example to monitor the driver as well as students on the bus. However, there is no suggestion in Passman that the user looking at the video feed(s) would need to select and input a content based parameter such as that described in Hendricks. Where Hendricks discloses a user, for educational purposes, selecting from a cameras identified on a world map to view live events in Egypt, Passman does not suggest a motivation for a similar use. Simply put, Passman teaches a system for continuous monitoring, typically for security purposes and not a system where a user

actively selects content to view based on the user's needs. Thus, the only motivation for the combination of the Passman and Hendricks references is provided by the present application, and as a result the combination is invalid for hindsight.

Additionally, with regard to claim 18, even if the references were combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the present invention would not result. Further modification of the combination would be required to arrive at the claimed invention. The combination does not teach or suggest organizing video information corresponding to an identified vehicle and displaying the video information such that the video information is shown sequentially from a first geographic location to a second geographic location. Rather, the combination teaches, as is disclosed in Hendricks, showing live video from one of a number of remote geographical locations. There is no teaching or suggestion of a sequential progression. Further modification of the references alone or in combination would be required to arrive at the claimed invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15, 17, 18, 22, 23 and 24 is requested.

Claims 27 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Passman in view of Jones and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,793,420 to Schmidt. Claim 27 has been rewritten in independent form. For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

Schmidt discloses a vehicle video system including multiple cameras. Two cameras are mounted to the outside of the bus, being attached at the driver's side of the bus and the side opposite the driver's side of the bus. The third camera is attached inside the bus and may be mounted to the rear view mirror. The cameras located outside the bus view an area where traffic approaches and passes the bus.

The camera located inside the bus views the passenger compartment therein.

The Examiner states that it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Schmidt regarding cameras that record information outside of a bus with the teachings of Passman. Applicant respectfully disagrees. There is no motivation in the art of record to make a combination in this manner. Passman teaches using a camera to monitor potential fights on a bus. Adding a camera to the outside of a bus does nothing to help this type of monitoring process.

Additionally, even if the references were combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the present invention would not result. The combination would not teach cameras in a vehicle directed to areas outside the vehicle. Rather, the combination would teach cameras inside a bus for viewing the areas inside of a bus and other cameras outside of the bus for viewing the areas outside of the bus. Further modification of the combination would be required to arrive at the claimed invention.

Further, regarding claim 29, claim 29 depends directly from claim 28 which is believed to be allowable for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 27 and 29 is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. HRA-12428.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK LLP

By 
James A. Balazs, Reg. No. 47401

4080 Erie Street
Willoughby, Ohio 44094-7836
(216) 566-9700